

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1-10 and 15 are now in the application. Claim 15 has been amended. Claims 1-10 have been withdrawn.

In item 3 on pages 2-3 of the above-mentioned Office action, claim 15 has been rejected as being unpatentable over Yamagishi et al. (Japanese Patent Application JP 6-291239) in view of Komata et al. (Japanese Patent Application JP 2-15897) and Bacon et al. (US Pat. No. 5,234,153) and Lin (US Pat. No. 4,791,075) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

In item 4 on pages 3-4 of the above-mentioned Office action, claim 15 has been rejected as being unpatentable over Yamagishi et al. in view of Ishii (Japanese Patent Application JP 6-326210), Bacon et al. and Sato et al. (Japanese Patent Application JP 61-150251) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

The rejections have been noted and claim 15 has been amended in an effort to even more clearly define the invention of the instant application. Support for the changes is found on page 9, lines 3-5 of the specification.

Before discussing the prior art in detail, it is believed that a brief review of the invention as claimed, would be helpful.

Claim 15 calls for, inter alia:

a semiconductor chip having a rear side and an adhesive or diffusion barrier provided on said rear side;

said semiconductor chip being secured to said substrate by one of alloying and brazing using said solder to form a direct chip-substrate connection.

None of the cited references discloses a semiconductor component in which the semiconductor chip has an adhesive or diffusion barrier provided on its rear side and the semiconductor chip is secured to the substrate by alloying or brazing using a solder having a hypereutectic composition of Au-Sn to form a direct chip-substrate connection.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claim 15. Claim 15 is, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claim 15 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate a telephone call

so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

In the alternative, the entry of the amendment is requested as it is believed to place the application in better condition for appeal, without requiring extension of the field of search.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made. Please charge any fees which might be due with respect to 37 CFR Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner and Greenberg, P.A., No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

LAWRENCE A. GREENBERG
REG. NO. 29,308



For Applicants

YC

April 5, 2004
Lerner and Greenberg, P.A.
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101